arXiv:cond-mat/9609016v1 2 Sep 1996

Non-magnetic Impurities in Spin Gap Systems

Naoto NAGAOSA, Akira FURUSAKI,[1] Manfred SIGRIST[1,*] and Hidetoshi FUKUYAMA[2]

Department of Applied Physics, University of Tokyo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113
[1] *Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-01*
[2] *Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113*

(Received August 27, 1996)

The effect of non-magnetic impurities is discussed for both the two-leg Heisenberg ladder system and other spin liquids with excitation gap. It is shown that the random depletion of spins introduces a random Berry phase term to the non-linear σ model. The classical nature of the antiferromagnetic correlation is enhanced by the topological decoherence, and the staggered susceptibility shows more singular behavior at low temperatures than the uniform antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain.

KEYWORDS: quantum spin chain, Heisenberg ladder, random spin system

Recently a class of quantum antiferromagnets which has a ground state with a gap in the spin excitation spectrum has attracted much attention. These systems are characterized either by a local singlet correlation of valence-bond-solid state as found in spin-Peierls systems [1] and even-leg spin ladders [2] or by resonating-valence-bond (RVB) state as in underdoped cuprates. In such systems it was found that the presence of non-magnetic impurities replacing magnetic ions often leads to a Curie behavior of the uniform susceptibility with a Curie constant proportional to the impurity concentration. This can be understood basically from the idea that, due to the depletion of spins, some spins lose their partners to form a singlet. They appear, therefore, as nearly independent spin doublet degrees of freedom. However, the more striking experimental feature is the appearance of the antiferromagnetic long-range order (AFLRO) induced by the non-magnetic impurities. This property has been observed essentially in all the systems mentioned above, [3, 4, 5] and thus seems to be a universal phenomenon in gapped quantum spin liquids. This effect has recently been analyzed in terms of the phase Hamiltonian for the spin-Peierls system by Fukuyama *et al.* [6] The presence of impurities leads to a local weakening of the dimerization, which induces enhanced local antiferromagnetic correlations. The AFLRO can then emerge at low temperatures, because the local antiferromagnetic moments around the impurities correlate in phase with each other. The phase Hamiltonian approach has also been applied to the two-leg spin ladder system with a single non-magnetic impurity. [7] In this case the phase field forms a soliton at the impurity position, which corresponds to an impurity-induced spin degree of freedom ($S = 1/2$). Local antiferromagnetic correlation appears in the vicinity of the impurity, and would turn to an in-phase (quasi) long-range ordered state in the ground state. [7] Sigrist and Furusaki pointed out that low-energy physics of the lightly depleted spin ladder system is described by a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg model with random ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic couplings. [8] They found that at low temperatures the uniform susceptibility follows the Curie law while the specific heat shows power-law behavior, $C \sim T^{2\alpha}$, where the exponent α is expected to be equal to or smaller than 0.25. On the other hand, in a recent numerical study Furukawa *et al.* found a significant enhancement of the staggered susceptibility $\chi(Q)$ in the presence of non-magnetic impurities. [9] The asymptotic behavior, however, could not be obtained because the size of the system they studied is not large enough.

In this paper we study the effect of non-magnetic impurities on gapped spin liquids via a mapping to the non-linear σ model with a random topological term. In this formulation the appearance of the AFLRO originates from the recovery of the topological Berry phase term, which suppresses quantum fluctuations such that the classical nature of the AFLRO is enhanced. We find that the generalized susceptibility $\chi(Q,T)$ diverges with a non-trivial exponent, $\chi(Q,T) \sim T^{-1-2\alpha}$, in the low-temperature limit. This divergence is much stronger than the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain. This picture also applies to higher-dimensional systems where quantum fluctuations suppress the AFLRO and generate the spin gap phase, even though the behavior of $\chi(Q,T)$ depends on the dimensionality.

For concreteness we consider the two-leg spin-S Heisenberg ladder as an example of gapped spin liquids. We use the functional integral method and write the partition function Z as

$$Z = \int D\boldsymbol{S}_i(\tau) e^{-A}. \tag{1}$$

The action A of the system is given by

$$A = \mathrm{i}S \sum_i \omega(\{\boldsymbol{S}_i(\tau)\}) + \int \mathrm{d}\tau \sum_{<ij>} J\boldsymbol{S}_i(\tau)\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_j(\tau). \tag{2}$$

The first term is the Berry phase contribution, where

---

[*] Present address: Theoretische Physik, ETH-Hönggerberg, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland.

$\omega(\{\boldsymbol{S}_i(\tau)\})$ is the solid angle enclosed by the closed trajectory of $\boldsymbol{S}_i(\tau)$ $[\boldsymbol{S}_i(0) = \boldsymbol{S}_i(\beta)]$. [10] The second term represents the nearest-neighbor antiferromagnetic interaction.

For the following discussion it is crucial to notice that no frustration is induced by the random depletion of spins because the bipartite lattice structure remains and the antiferromagnetic interaction works only between A- and B-sublattice spins. Consequently we should choose the staggered spin as the slowly varying field. On the other hand, the Hamiltonian commutes with the total spin so that the Fourier components with small wavevectors are also expected to be slowly varying. From these considerations we may express a spin operator in terms of two slowly varying fields, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}(x_i, \tau)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Pi}(x_i, \tau)$:

$$\boldsymbol{S}_i(\tau) = S[(-1)^i \boldsymbol{\Omega}(x_i, \tau) + a\boldsymbol{\Pi}(x_i, \tau)]. \tag{3}$$

Here a is the lattice constant, and the two fields satisfy the constraint, $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Pi} = 0$ and $|\boldsymbol{\Omega}| = 1$. We can then apply the standard procedure to derive the non-linear σ model.

Before discussing the randomly depleted Heisenberg ladder we first consider pure spin systems. It is well known that the effective action A for a single Heisenberg chain is [10]

$$A = A_{\mathrm{Berry}} + \frac{1}{2g}\int_0^\beta \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}x \left[\frac{1}{c}\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Omega}}{\partial \tau}\right)^2 + c\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Omega}}{\partial x}\right)^2\right], \tag{4}$$

where the dimensionless coupling constant $g = 2/S$ controls the quantum fluctuations, and the velocity $c = 2JSa$ sets the energy scale. The Berry phase term A_{Berry} is given by

$$A_{\mathrm{Berry}} = 2\pi \mathrm{i} Q S, \tag{5}$$

where Q is an integer called Skyrmion number,

$$Q = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_0^\beta \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}x\, \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Omega}}{\partial \tau} \times \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Omega}}{\partial x}\right). \tag{6}$$

For half integer S the Berry phase is the multiple of π and thus causes destructive interference between the quantum fluctuations with different Skyrmion numbers. This leads to the massless spectrum of the triplet excitations. For integer S, however, the Berry phase plays no role for the infinite system and quantum fluctuations generate the spin gap. [11] In the case of the pure two-leg spin ladder, one leg of the ladder contributes A_{Berry} to the effective action, while the other leg gives $A_{\mathrm{Berry}}(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \to -\boldsymbol{\Omega})$. The Berry phase terms thus cancel, and the action is just the non-linear σ model without a topological term. [12,13] Hence the spin gap opens similarly to the integer spin chain.

Now we turn to the randomly depleted spin ladder. We note that removing spins from the ladder affects the effective action in two ways. An obvious effect is the local weakening of the coupling J which leads to the reduction in the sound velocity c. This tends to decrease the energy scale of the problem. The other effect is of quantum mechanical nature and is related to the Berry phase. The cancelation of the Berry phases as described above is violated by the depleted spins, and the Berry phase term A_{Berry} becomes

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathrm{Berry}} &= \mathrm{i}S \sum_{i \neq i_n} \omega(\{\boldsymbol{S}(x_i, \tau)\}) \\ &= \mathrm{i}S \sum_i \omega(\{\boldsymbol{S}(x_i, \tau)\}) - \mathrm{i}S \sum_n \omega(\{\boldsymbol{S}(x_{i_n}, \tau)\}) \\ &= -\mathrm{i}S \sum_n (-1)^{i_n} \omega(\{\boldsymbol{\Omega}(x_{i_n}, \tau)\}), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where i_n specifies the site of a depleted spin. This modification leads to a substantial change in the quantum mechanical behavior of the system described by eqs. (4) and (7), as we will see later.

In the next step we integrate over the continuum degrees of freedom $\boldsymbol{\Omega}(x \neq x_{i_n}, \tau)$ to derive the effective action for $\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau) \equiv \boldsymbol{\Omega}(x = x_{i_n}, \tau)$. To this end we introduce the Lagrange multiplier $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i$ to implement the constraint $\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}(x = x_{i_n}, \tau)$, and write Z as

$$Z = \int D\boldsymbol{\Omega} \int D\boldsymbol{\lambda} \int D\boldsymbol{I}\, \mathrm{e}^{-A_{\mathrm{eff}}}. \tag{8}$$

The effective action A_{eff} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathrm{eff}} = &-\mathrm{i}S \sum_n (-1)^{i_n} \omega(\{\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau)\}) \\ &+ \frac{c}{2g}\sum_{k,\omega_l}\left[\left(\frac{\omega_l}{c}\right)^2 + k^2 + \frac{1}{l_0^2}\right] \boldsymbol{\Omega}(k, \omega_l) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}(-k, -\omega_l) \\ &+ \mathrm{i}\sum_n \sum_{\omega_l} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n(-\omega_l) \cdot \left(\boldsymbol{I}_n(\omega_l) - \sum_k \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}kx_{i_n}}}{\sqrt{L}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}(k, \omega_l)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where ω_l is the Matsubara frequency for bosonic fields, and $(-1)^{i_n} = +1$ (-1) if x_{i_n} is on the A-sublattice (B-sublattice). In eq. (9) we have introduced a mass c/l_0 in the second term. This corresponds to taking saddle-point approximation for a Lagrange multiplier field representing the constraint $|\boldsymbol{\Omega}| = 1$. This can be justified, in the limit of small impurity concentration, by noting that l_0 is the finite correlation length of the pure two-leg spin ladder. We then integrate over $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathrm{eff}} = &-\mathrm{i}S \sum_n (-1)^{i_n} \omega(\{\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau)\}) \\ &+ \mathrm{i}\sum_n \sum_{\omega_l} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n(-\omega_l) \cdot \boldsymbol{I}_n(\omega_l) \\ &+ \frac{g}{2c}\sum_{m,n} K_{m,n}(\omega_l) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_m(\omega_l) \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n(-\omega_l), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where we have ignored an additive constant coming from integration over $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$, and

$$K_{m,n}(\omega_l) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}k}{2\pi} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}k(x_{i_m} - x_{i_n})}}{k^2 + k_0^2} = \frac{1}{2k_0}\mathrm{e}^{-k_0|x_{i_m} - x_{i_n}|} \tag{11}$$

with $k_0 = \left[(\omega_l/c)^2 + l_0^{-2}\right]^{1/2}$. For the case where the concentration δ of the non-magnetic impurities is very small ($a/\delta \gg l_0$), we can approximate K^{-1} as

$$(K^{-1})_{m,n} \approx 2k_0\left(\delta_{m,n} - \delta_{m,n\pm 1}\mathrm{e}^{-k_0|x_{i_m} - x_{i_n}|}\right). \tag{12}$$

After integrating over $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i$ we obtain, for $|\omega_n| \ll c/l_0$,

$$A_{\rm eff} = -{\rm i}S\sum_n(-1)^{i_n}\omega(\{\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau)\}) - \int_0^\beta {\rm d}\tau \sum_n \tilde{J}{\rm e}^{-|x_{i_n}-x_{i_{n+1}}|/l_0}\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau)\cdot\boldsymbol{I}_{n+1}(\tau), \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{J} = ck_0/g$. Equation (13) can be identified with the action for the random-exchange Heisenberg model (REHM),

$$H = -\sum_n J_n \boldsymbol{S}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{n+1}, \quad (14)$$

where $\boldsymbol{S}_n = (-1)^{i_n+1}\boldsymbol{I}_n$. The exchange interaction J_n is given by $J_n = \tilde{J}(-1)^{i_n+i_{n+1}}\exp(-|x_{i_n} - x_{i_{n+1}}|/l_0)$, which is random in sign as well as in magnitude. [8] Note that the two spins $\boldsymbol{S}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{n+1}$ are coupled ferromagnetically (antiferromagnetically) if they are on the same (different) sublattice(s). [8] It is important to notice that the dependence of the effective action on the impurity concentration δ appears only in the magnitude of the exchange interaction J_n, which is typically of the order of $J{\rm e}^{-l_0/\delta}$.

The low-energy properties of the REHM have recently been studied by Westerberg *et al.* using a real-space renormalization group method. [14, 15, 16] They found that the correlation length ξ for the staggered spin $\boldsymbol{I}_n$ diverges at low temperatures as [15]

$$\xi \sim T^{-2\alpha}, \quad (15)$$

where the exponent α was estimated numerically to be 0.22. Inside a domain of length ξ the spins $\boldsymbol{S}_n$ align almost parallel or antiparallel to each other depending on the sign of J_n. These strongly correlated spins form a single effective spin, whose spin size can be estimated from a random-walk argument. [14, 16] Since the sign of J_n is random, the spin size $S_{\rm tot}$ is given by a random sum of positive and negative numbers, thereby yielding $S_{\rm tot} \sim \sqrt{\xi}$. Consequently, the uniform susceptibility $\chi_{\boldsymbol{S}}(T)$ per site behaves as

$$\chi_{\boldsymbol{S}}(T) \sim \frac{1}{T}\frac{S_{\rm tot}^2}{\xi(T)} \sim \frac{1}{T}, \quad (16)$$

and the Curie law persists down to zero temperature. [14] In contrast to $\boldsymbol{S}_n$, the staggered spins $\boldsymbol{I}_n$ align always parallel to each other inside the domain. Thus the total spin size $I_{\rm tot}$ of the staggered spins $\boldsymbol{I}_n$ inside the domain is proportional to ξ. Hence the generalized (staggered) susceptibility $\chi_{\boldsymbol{I}}(T)$ behaves as

$$\chi_{\boldsymbol{I}}(T) \sim \frac{1}{T}\frac{I_{\rm tot}^2}{\xi(T)} \sim \frac{\xi}{T} \sim T^{-1-2\alpha}, \quad (17)$$

which is more singular than the staggered susceptibility of the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain. This implies that the impurity-induced staggered moments $\boldsymbol{I}_n$ show at least quasi-long-range order at zero temperature, which, even with an infinitesimal inter-ladder coupling, will turn into true long-range order, in agreement with the experimental observation.

Let us examine the REHM in eqs. (13) and (14) in more detail. As we discussed above, the spin quantum number $S_{\rm eff}$ of the effective spin representing the correlated spins scales as $S_{\rm eff} \sim \sqrt{\xi(T)}$, which grows with decreasing temperature. This can be considered as an intermediate case between the ferromagnetic Heisenberg chain where $S_{\rm eff} \sim \xi$ and the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain where $S_{\rm eff}$ is at most S. This means that the classical nature of $\boldsymbol{I}$ is more enhanced in the randomly depleted Heisenberg ladder than in the pure spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain, as we see in eq. (17). We summarize these considerations in Table I, where four universality classes of one-dimensional quantum spin chains are classified according to the degree of quantum fluctuations of the field $\boldsymbol{I}$. The Berry phase term is most effective in the 1st class while it plays no role in the 4th class, where quantum fluctuations dynamically generate a mass. The even-leg spin ladders without impurities also belong to this class. We see that, as the Berry phase term becomes more and more effective, the classical nature of $\boldsymbol{I}$ emerges, leading to the enhanced generalized susceptibility $\chi_{\boldsymbol{I}}(T)$. It is important to notice that any small amount of non-magnetic impurities is sufficient to change the universality class of the pure spin liquids, e.g., the even-leg spin ladders, from the 4th class to the 2nd class. This is due to the decoherence by the random Berry phase term. A similar idea has been discussed recently by Prokof'ev and Stamp for quantum nanomagnets. [17, 18] Here some remarks are in order on the random singlet phase, in which spins far apart form weakly bound singlet pairs in a random manner. [19, 20] This phase is realized in the random antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model where the exchange couplings are all antiferromagnetic but are random in their magnitude. In this case the Berry phase term is not affected by the randomness, and the singlet formation of spins plays an essential role. We did not include this phase in Table I, because the randomness is not of topological nature. Therefore Table I is not intended to exhaust all the universality classes of the quantum spin chains.

Finally, we briefly discuss the two-dimensional case for which the mapping to the non-linear σ model can be used in exactly the same way as in the one-dimensional case. For example, in the Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the square lattice, Berry phases of each row cancel as in the spin ladder, and thus there is no topological term for the slowly varying field Ω. [10] For $S = \frac{1}{2}$ the dimensionless coupling constant $g \sim 1/S$ is not large enough for the quantum fluctuations to destroy the AFLRO. However, as the mobile holes are doped into the antiferromagnet (e.g., doped high-Tc cuprates), the AFLRO is rapidly suppressed and eventually destroyed. These holes are localized when Zn impurities are doped sufficiently. In this case both the Zn impurities and the localized holes contribute to the random Berry phase terms in the non-linear σ model. Then we expect that the antiferromagnetic correlation is enhanced and the AFLRO is recovered with non-magnetic impurities, which is indeed observed in a recent experiment on the underdoped cuprates with the (pseudo) spin gap. [5] The problem of the coexistence with the mobile holes and Zn impurities is left for future study.

Before summarizing the results, we point out that a

Table I. Universality classes of one-dimensional quantum spin chains classified in terms of the Berry phase.

	class	Berry phase	specific heat	generalized susceptibility
1.	ferromagnets	$\mathrm{i}S\sum_n \omega(\{\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau)\})$	$C \sim \sqrt{T}$	$\chi_{\boldsymbol{I}} \sim T^{-2}$
2.	random-exchange Heisenberg model	$\mathrm{i}S\sum_n \sigma_n\omega(\{\boldsymbol{I}_n(\tau)\})$ $(\sigma_n = \pm 1)$	$C \sim T^{2\alpha}$	$\chi_{\boldsymbol{I}} \sim T^{-1-2\alpha}$
3.	antiferromagnets (half-integer S)	$2\pi \mathrm{i}SQ$ (Q: Skyrmion number)	$C \sim T$	$\chi_{\boldsymbol{I}} \sim T^{-1}$
4.	antiferromagnets (integer S)	$2\pi \mathrm{i}SQ$ (Q: Skyrmion number)	$C \sim \mathrm{e}^{-\Delta/T}$	$\chi_{\boldsymbol{I}} \sim$ const

non-linear σ model with a random topological term has also been discussed in the context of the localization of a particle in a random magnetic field. [21] It is an interesting future problem to explore further this connection between these two apparently different problems, the random-exchange Heisenberg model and the random flux problem.

In summary, we have studied the effects of nonmagnetic impurities in gapful spin liquids. We have shown that the depletion of spins induces the random Berry phases, leading to the destructive interference of quantum fluctuations. The effective low-energy model for the randomly depleted spin ladder is the random-exchange Heisenberg chain, in which the generalized susceptibility for the staggered moment diverges as $T^{-1-2\alpha}$ ($\alpha \approx 0.22$). The correlation of the staggered spin moment becomes more classical due to the decoherence by the random Berry phase term.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to N. Furukawa, M. Imada, T. M. Rice, P. C. E. Stamp and S. C. Zhang for stimulating discussions. This work was initiated during the workshop on strongly correlated electron systems at Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University. One of the authors (M.S.) is also supported by a fellowship (PROFIL) of the Swiss Nationalfonds.

---

[1] M. Hase, I. Terasaki and K. Uchinokura: Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993) 3651.
[2] For a recent review see E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice: Science **271** (1996) 618.
[3] L. P. Regnault, J. P. Renard, G. Dhalenne and A. Revcolevschi: Europhys. Lett. **32** (1995) 579.
[4] M. Azuma, Y. Fujishiro, M. Takano, T. Ishida, K. Okuda, M. Nohara and H. Takagi: preprint.
[5] P. Mendels *et al.* Phys. Rev. B **49** (1994) 10035; S. Uchida: private communications.
[6] H. Fukuyama, T. Tanimoto and M. Saito: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65** (1996) 1183.
[7] H. Fukuyama, N. Nagaosa, M. Saito and T. Tanimoto: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65** (1996) No. 8.
[8] M. Sigrist and A. Furusaki: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65** (1996) No. 8.
[9] N. Furukawa *et al.*: preprint.
[10] See, for example, E. Fradkin: *Field Theories of Condensed Matter Systems*, (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1991).
[11] F. D. M. Haldane: Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983) 1153.
[12] D. Sénéchal: Phys. Rev. B **52** (1995) 15319.
[13] G. Sierra: J. Phys. A **29** (1996) 3299.
[14] E. Westerberg, A. Furusaki, M. Sigrist and P. A. Lee: Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 4302.
[15] E. Westerberg, A. Furusaki, M. Sigrist and P. A. Lee: preprint.
[16] See also A. Furusaki, M. Sigrist, E. Westerberg, P. A. Lee, K. B. Tanaka and N. Nagaosa: Phys. Rev. B **52** (1995) 15930.
[17] N. V. Prokof'ev and P. C. E. Stamp: J. Phys. Condens. Matter **5** (1993) L663.
[18] N. V. Prokof'ev and P. C. E. Stamp: cond-mat/9511011.
[19] D. S. Fisher: Phys. Rev. B **50** (1994) 3799, and references therein.
[20] For discussions on the difference between the random singlet phase and the large spin phase realized in the REHM, see refs. 14 and 15.
[21] S.-C. Zhang and D. Arovas: Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** (1994) 1886.